

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/848,952	05/03/2001	Marc Lurie	26625-703	26625-703 6922	
21971 7:	590 02/01/2006		EXAMINER		
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI 650 PAGE MILL ROAD			RUTTEN, JAMES D		
	CA 94304-1050	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2192		
			DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/848,952	LURIE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
J. Derek Rutten	2192	

	J. Derek Rutten	2192				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 03 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	RALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply more	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this h 		in the final rejection, wh	ichover is later. In			
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b NOTICE OF APPEAL	ktension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig or than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
	-11	Clark with the boson as a will				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause			
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amandment	(DTOL 324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant Amendinent	(P10L-324).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	•	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).	mowable ii submitted iii a separate,	unlery med amending	an canceling the			
7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-38</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 09/848,952

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Replacement of the phrase "one or more data element..." with positive recitation of "data elements..." changes the scope of independent claims 1, 15, 25, 27, 29, and 36 and would require further consideration and may require further search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive.

On page 11 of the reply, in the first full paragraph, Applicant essentially argues that the Wadhwa reference does not teach the data models as claimed, which include "the data model defining one or more data elements..." However, this limitation is not present in the proposed claims. The alternative language "one or more" has been removed from the claims. However, if interpreted using the phrase, Wadhwa teaches at least data relationship attributes (Wadhwa column 6 lines 59-63) as pointed out on page 6 of the 11/01/05 Final Action. As indicated in box 3 above, further consideration and/or search is required for the proposed amendment.

On page 11 paragraph 2, Applicant argues that "the references are devoid of any motivation for their combination", and suggests that no portion of the references was cited to support a motivation. However, review of the Final Action reveals the citation of Wadhwa column 7 lines 16-18 as support for motivation. This passage suggests that entity relationship models enable subsequent reuse. Reuse is a basic objective of object-oriented software, and allows a single implementation to be reused by a variety of applications, or in the case of Wright, a variety of clients, in an effort to reduce implementation costs. Therefore, Wadhwa provides motivation as cited in the Final Action.

In response to applicant's apparent argument that Wadhwa is nonanalogous art (top of page 12), it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both Wright and Wadhwa are interested in the distribution of executable software in a heterogeneous environment and use modeling concepts as a tool to further that goal.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER